8 9 10

11

12

13

16

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

PENTALPHA MACAU COMMERCIAL OFFSHORE LIMITED,

Plaintiff,

٧.

14 DAMODER REDDY, et al.,

15 Defendants

DAMODER REDDY,

Counterclaimant,

18

PENTALPHA OFFSHORE LIMITED, et al.,

Counterdefendants

21

19

20

22

2425

23

26

2728

Before the Court is counterclaimant Damoder Reddy's Objection to Report and Recommendation on Pentalpha's Motion for Sanctions Dated September 9, 2005. Having reviewed the objection, the Court deems the matter suitable for decision on the papers,

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

VACATES the hearing scheduled for November 4, 2005, and rules as follows.

Having reviewed de novo the Report and Recommendation, as well as the record before the Magistrate Judge, <u>see</u> 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1), the Court hereby DENIES the objection. Contrary to Reddy's argument that he complied with the Court's order of June

No. C 03-5914 MMC

ORDER DENYING OBJECTION TO REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2005; ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2005; VACATING HEARING

24, 2005, he plainly did not, as he failed to set forth in his discovery responses, inter alia, a "detailed factual basis for contending that Pentalpha converted any specific item of Reddy's property," (see Stipulation and Order Re Further Discovery Responses, filed June 24, 2005, at 2:7-9), a "valuation of each element of damages for each specific item of allegedly converted property," (see id. at 2:10-11), "all persons who he alleges . . . defamed him, including each individual's name, address, and position held at . . . Pentalpha," (see id. at 2:13-15), and "each act by Pentalpha that he contends caused emotional distress," (see id. at 3:2-3). Further, as set forth in the Report and Recommendation, Reddy's failure to comply with the Court's order was willful, i.e., it was not accidental or the result of an oversight. Lastly, a review of the record reflects no good cause for Reddy's failure to comply with the Court's order.

Accordingly, the Court hereby ADOPTS the Report and Recommendation filed September 9, 2005.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 3, 2005